

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/775,334	KIMELMAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Christopher E. Lee	2111

All Participants: **Status of Application:** RCE

(1) Christopher E. Lee (USPTO). (3) _____

(2) John R. Lastova (Reg. No. 33,149). (4) _____

Date of Interview: 5 December 2006 **Time:** 9:20am (est)

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Claim 13

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Claim 13 is objected since a typographical error, i.e., the language "said said step" in line 1. The Examiner suggests deletion of the duplicated term "said" in the language. The Applicants' representative agrees to the Examiner's suggestion.

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)